

## Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02663 021959 Z

44

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 PM-09

INR-10 L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01

USIA-12 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 H-02 NSC-10 SS-14 OIC-04 AEC-11

AECE-00 ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /154 W  
----- 086078

P R 021904 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8304

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO

USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L VIENNA 2663

DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US REP MBFR

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MBFR: CHAIRMAN'S REPORT FOR WEEK MARCH 25 - APRIL 1, 1973

FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF THE CHAIRMAN'S REPORT ( US) FOR THE WEEK  
OF MARCH 25 - APRIL 1 WHICH WAS EXAMINED BY THE AD HOC GROUP ON  
MARCH 30. PLEASE PASS TO SECRETARY GENERAL.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02663 021959 Z

BEGIN TEXT:

1. IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE USUAL PRACTICE OF THE AD HOC GROUP,

THE FOLLOWING REPORT IS SUBMITTED AS THE CHAIRMANS' S WON  
ACCOUNT OF THE WEEK' S PROCEEDINGS.

2. DURING THE LAST WEEK, DISCUSSION WITH THE EAST AND WITHIN  
THE AD HOC GROUP AGAIN FOCUSED ON THE KEY ISSUE OF HUNGARIAN  
PARTICIPATION. TWO FURTHER MEETINGS TOOK PLACE BETWEEN ALLIED  
REPRESENTATIVES AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPRESENTATIVES, THE  
SIXTH AND SEVENTH IN THE CURRENT SERIES FOLLOWING ON THE COUNCIL' S  
QUIDANCE OF MARCH 13. THE MEETINGS WERE INCONCLUSIVE AND IT IS  
NOT YET POSSIBLE TO MAKE A DEFINITIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE EXPLOR-  
ATIONS. THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES REITERATED THEIR POSITION  
THAT HUNGARY SHOULD NOT BE A DIRECT PARTICIPANT, ARGUING THAT IT  
MUST EITHER BE AN INDIRECT PARTICIPANT, OR ITS PARTICIPATION  
IN ANY AGREEMENTS OR MEASURES MUST BE MATCHED BY THAT OF ITALY.  
THE EASTERN INTERLOCUTORS COUNTERED ALLIED ARGUMENTS AND EFFORTS  
AIRMED AT FINDING A POSSIBLE SOLUTION BY SAYING THAT ALLIED  
IDEAS DID NOT TAKE ACCOUNT OF SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN POSITIONS.

3. DURING THESE EXPLORATORY SESSIONS, THE NETHERLANDS AND US  
REPS MAINTAINED THE AGREED ALLIED VIEW THAT THE STATUS OF HUNGARY,  
IF IT CANNOT AT PRESENT BE AGREED UPON AS THAT OF A DIRECT  
PARTICIPANT, SHOULD BE LEFT FOR RESOLUTION AT A LATER STAGE.  
THEY ARGUED THAT THIS POSITION WAS ONE OF SIMPLE EQUITY,  
REPRESENTING THE MIDDLE GROUOND BETWEEN THE EASTERN VIEW THAT  
HUNGARY SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM DIRECT PARTICIPATION AND THE  
ALLIED VIEW THAT IT SHOULD BE INCLUDED. THEY FURTHER UNDERScoreD  
THAT, IF THE STATUS OF HUNGARY WERE AGREED FOR THE PURPOSE OF  
PRESENT TALKS AS UNRESOLVED, IT MUST REMAIN A SUBJECT THAT ALL  
PARTIES NOW AGREED COULD AND WOULD BE RAISED IN SUBSEQUENT  
NEGOTIATIONS, AND WITH THE CLEAR UNDERSTANDING THAT THE ALLIES  
WOULD BE FREE TO RAISE THIS ISSUE IN THE FUTURE TO PROTECT THEIR  
LEGITIMATE SECURITY INTERESTS. THE ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES ALSO  
MADE CLEAR THAT THE STATUS OF ITALY AS A SPECIAL PARTICIPANT HAD  
NOT ONLY BEEN CLEARLY STATED BY THE ALLIES, BUT HAD ALSO BEEN  
ACCEPTED IN EASTERN REPLIES TO THE ALLIED INVITATION OF NOVEMBER  
15, AND THUS WAS NOT AN ISSUE FOR DISCUSSION.

4. DURING THE MARCH 28 SESSION, THE EASTERN SIDE ALSO QUESTIONED  
THE ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES ONN THE POSSIBILITY OF AN AGREED  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02663 021959 Z

SINGLE STATEMENT, OR COMPLEMENTARY UNILATERAL STATEMENTS, ON  
THE FUTURE STATUS OF HUNGARY. THE ALLIED SPOKESMEN EXPLAINED  
THAT ANY SUCH STATEMENTS, WHICH WOULD BE PART OF AN AGREED PAPER  
ON PROCEDURES, SHOULD HAVE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME CONTENT AS A  
SINGLE AGREED STATEMENT, INCLUDING THE CONCEPTS THAT THE QUESTION  
OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS, DECISIONS, OR  
MEASURES REMAINS OPEN; THAT THE STATUS OF HUNGARY IN THE PRESENT  
CONSULTATIONS MUST BE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO ITS FUTURE ROLE IN  
NEGOTIATIONS; AND THAT HUNGARY' S FUTURE INVOLVEMENT IN AGREE-  
MENTS, DECISIONS OR MEASURES IS ONE THAT CAN AND WILL BE EXAMINED

AND DECIDED IN THE COURSE OF PENDING NEGOTIATIONS. THE EASTERN SPOKESMEN AGREED TO EXAMINE THESE CONCEPTS AND MAKE A CONSIDERED COMMENT ON THEM AT A LATER TIME. THEY SAID THAT THEIR INITIAL REACTIONS, HOWEVER, WAS THAT THE ALLIES WERE SEEKING TO BUILD A CASE FOR FUTURE INVOLVEMENT OF HUNGARY IN MEASURES WITHOUT ANY MATCHING INVOLVEMENT FOR ITALY.

5. DURING THE MARCH 30 SESSION, THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES SAID THAT, ON REFLECTION, THEY FOUND THAT THE CONCEPTS GIVEN BY THE ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES ON THE CONTENT OF POSSIBLE STATEMENTS WERE REALLY DESIGNED TO ASSURE THE FUTURE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY IN AGREEMENTS, WHILE PREJUDICING IN ADVANCE ANY POSSIBLE EASTERN CLAIM THAT ITALY BE SIMILARLY INCLUDED, AND THUS WERE NOT EQUITABLE. THEY FURTHER SAID THAT THEY HAD THE IMPRESSION THAT THE ALLIED CONCEPTS SERVED IN EFFECT TO DECIDE IN ADVANCE THAT HUNGARY WOULD BE A DIRECT PARTICIPANT. THE ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES REPLIED THAT THESE CONCEPTS WERE DESIGNED TO KEEP THE HUNGARIAN QUESTION OPEN, AND WARRANTED FURTHER EXAMINATION IN THIS CONTEXT. IN RESPONSE TO AN ALLIED REQUEST FOR NEW EASTERN IDEAS, THE SOVIETS REPEATED THE CONCEPT OF 19 OVERALL PARTICIPANTS, 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, 8 SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS, AND SOME FORMULA FOR ENLARGEMENT OF THE CATEGORY OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THE ALLIED EMISSARIES MADE CLEAR THAT THIS WAS NEITHER A NEW NOR A PRODUCTIVE APPROACH.

6. IN AD HOC GROUP DISCUSSIONS, THE QUESTION OF SOVIET TACTICS WAS EVALUATED. IT WAS APPARENT THAT EASTERN SPOKESMEN HAD NOT BEEN FORTHCOMING WITH NEW IDEAS WITHIN THE ONE WEEK PERIOD OF THIS REPORT, BUT RATHER CONTINUED TO PROBE AND CRITIQUE THE ALLIED POSITION. IT WAS NOT CLEAR TO MEMBERS OF THE GROUP WHETHER THE EAST WAS SEEKING DELAY FOR ITS OWN SAKE, OR WAS AWAITING NEW INSTRUCTIONS. IT WAS GENERALLY FELT THAT NO CONCLUSIONS COULD YET BE DRAWN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02663 021959 Z

AND THAT THIS QUESTION WOULD BECOME CLEARER IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

7. IN BILATERAL DISCUSSIONS, AND DURING THE CANADIAN RECEPTION MARCH 28, THE ALLIES MAINTAINED A STRONG FRONT IN SUPPORT OF THE COUNCIL'S POSITION OF MARCH 13. EASTERN SUGGESTIONS THAT THE ALLIES WERE ANXIOUS ABOUT THE SLOW PACE OF THE TALKS WERE COUNTERED, AS WELL AS THE RELATED IDEA RAISED BY SEVERAL EASTERN DELEGATIONS, BUT OPPOSED BY THE SOVIETS, THAT THERE SHOULD BE AN EASTERN RECESS IN THE DISCUSSIONS.

END TEXT HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 07 MAY 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 02 APR 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973VIENNA02663  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19730460/abqcello.tel  
**Line Count:** 159  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** ACTION MBF  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 01 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <01-Aug-2001 by reddocgw>; APPROVED <29-Aug-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 971118  
**Subject:** MBFR: CHAIRMAN' S REPORT FOR WEEK MARCH 25 - APRIL 1, 1973  
**TAGS:** PARM, AU  
**To:** STATE INFO SECDEF  
BONN  
HELSINKI  
LONDON  
MOSCOW  
NATO  
USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT  
USCINCEUR  
USDOCOSOUTH  
SALT TWO  
GENEVA

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005